

**Appl. No.** : 09/904,937  
**Filed** : July 12, 2001

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed December 19, 2003 (Paper No. 20031203), the Examiner rejected Claims 36-50 and 52-53 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with which the Applicant regards as the invention. In addition, the Examiner rejected Claim 51 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kotzab (US 6,280,665) or Jung (US 6,463,999). Moreover, the Examiner rejected Claim 49 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorensen et al. (US 6,086,808) in view of Shimizu et al. (US 6,071,454). However, by this paper, the Applicant believes that the claims as amended herein distinguish the art of record. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in the light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 36, 49, and 52 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. However, the Applicant has amended Claims 36 and 49 according to the Examiner's suggestion by deleting "smaller" therefrom. In addition, the Applicant has amended Claim 52 according to the Examiner's suggestions as disclosed in the Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further rejected Claim 49 of the pending application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorensen in view of Shimizu. However, the Applicant notes that Sorensen fails to disclose a handling system comprising at least two arms independently extendable into the first and second separation planes of a stack mold with a center platen as claimed by the Applicant in Claim 49. Sorensen does not teach this. In fact, Sorensen teaches a single robot arm that is inserted in the first separation plane of the stack mold and then in the second separation plane, which is functionally different than the Applicant's claimed invention of Claim 49.

Since Sorensen expressly teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention as defined by Claim 49, there can be no suggestion to modify Sorensen with the teachings of Shimizu to thereby produce the Applicant's claimed invention. In fact, Shimizu fails to teach a robot or handling arm, and the two molds C1 and C2 are rotated instead of a handling arm as

Appl. No. : 09/904,937  
Filed : July 12, 2001

claimed by the Applicant in Claim 49. Therefore, Sorensen and Shimizu in combination or otherwise fails to teach the subject matter of the Applicant's claimed invention in Claim 49.


For these reasons, the Applicant submits that Claims 36 and 49 as amended herein are patentable over the art of record and respectfully requests express allowance of the same. In addition, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the remaining Claims 37-48 and 50-53, which further define patentable subject matter and are allowable due to their dependencies on amended Claims 36 and 49, respectively. The Applicant further acknowledges the withdrawal of Claims 28-35 from consideration.

From the foregoing, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and the Applicant requests the prompt allowance of the same. The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the application in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below. Please, charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time or credit overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 3-19-2001

By:   
Jeffrey A. Hopkins  
Registration No. 53,034  
Agent of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(909) 781-9231

R:\DOCS\JQH\JQH-2072.DOC:lw  
031704